



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,009	10/25/2000	Bruce L. Davis	098888-1561	4530
99103	7590	03/16/2011		
Foley & Lardner LLP 150 EAST GILMAN STREET P.O. BOX 1497 MADISON, WI 53701-1497			EXAMINER JANVIER, JEAN D	
			ART UNIT 3688	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/16/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
2
3

4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* BRUCE L. DAVIS and
9 GEOFFREY B. RHOADS
10

11
12 Appeal 2010-002996
13 Application 09/697,009
14 Technology Center 3600
15

16
17 Before HUBERT C. LORIN, ANTON W. FETTING, and
18 JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
19 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

20 DECISION ON APPEAL¹

¹ The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE²

Bruce L. Davis and Geoffrey B. Rhoads (Appellants) seek review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 2 and 5-7, the only claims pending in the application on appeal. We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

The Appellants invented a way of using digitally marked objects with promotional campaigns (Specification 1:8-10).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 5, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

5. A method comprising:

[1] presenting a digitally watermarked object to a reader device at a first location,

decoding information from the watermark, and

triggering a first response thereto; and

[2] presenting the object to a reader device at a second location,

decoding information from the watermark, and

² Our decision will make reference to the Appellants' Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed March 16, 2006) and Reply Brief ("Reply Br.," filed December 7, 2009), and the Supplemental Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed October 6, 2009).

1 triggering a second, different, response thereto.

2 The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Lemon US 4,674,041 Jun. 16, 1987

3 Claims 2 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
4 unpatentable over Lemon.

5 ISSUES

6 The issue of obviousness turns on whether there is evidence to show it
7 was predictable to one of ordinary skill to use a watermark with Lemon.

8 FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

9 The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be
10 supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

11 *Facts Related to the Prior Art - Lemon*

12 01. Lemon is directed to distributing coupons or other redemption
13 certificates for retail sales of merchandise. Lemon 1:7-9.

14 02. Lemon uses digital data encoded on the magnetic stripe of a
15 credit card for its promotions. Lemon 5:32-6:11. Lemon does not
16 describe using watermarks.

17 ANALYSIS

18 We agree with the Appellants, that Lemon fails to describe using
19 watermarks and the Examiner has provided no evidence to show it was
20 predictable to one of ordinary skill to use a watermark with Lemon.

1 Although the Specification does not define a digital watermark, the term
2 is well understood in the graphic arts as data encoded into a digital image.³
3 Clearly the credit card stripe used by Lemon does not fit within this and the
4 Examiner found so. Instead, the Examiner took official notice of the
5 notoriety of digital watermarks. Ans. 7. While we agree digital watermarks
6 are notoriously well known, that does not resolve the issue of whether it was
7 predictable to trigger two different responses at two different devices after
8 reading the same watermark. The Examiner apparently found that such a
9 watermark would have been predictably used in place of Lemon's credit
10 card stripe, but no evidence or even convincing line of reasoning why one of
11 ordinary skill would have thought to make that substitution is provided. The
12 Examiner instead found that such a digital watermark was non-functional
13 descriptive material, which we cannot agree with since the claim
14 functionally responds to the same watermark in two different manners.

15 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16 Rejecting claims 2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable
17 over Lemon is in error.

18 DECISION

19 The rejection of claims 2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as
20 unpatentable over Lemon is not sustained.

21

³PhotoNotes.org Dictionary of Film and Digital Photography
<http://photonotes.org/cgi-bin/entry.pl?id=Digitalwatermark>

REVERSED

1

2

3

4

5 mev

6

7 Address

8 DIGIMARC CORPORATION

9 9405 SW GEMINI DRIVE

10 BEAVERTON OR 97008